

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA RIVER
WATCH, et al.,

No. C 06-06685 CRB

ORDER

Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH &
GAME, et al.,

Defendants.

Now pending before the Court is plaintiffs' motion to shorten time to hear their motion to continue defendants' summary judgment motion. Plaintiffs contend that they need a continuance to conduct discovery before they can respond to defendants' summary judgment motion.

Plaintiffs' ex parte motion is DENIED. First, plaintiffs did not comply with Civil Local Rule 6-3. Second, plaintiffs' motion to continue does not establish that a continuance pursuant to Federal Rule of 56(f) is warranted. While they generally identify the subject matter of the discovery they would like to take, they do not explain how such discovery directly responds to the grounds upon which defendants' motion is based. See Garrett v. City and County of San Francisco, 818 F.2d 1515, 1518 (9th Cir.1987) (In making a Rule 56(f) motion, a party opposing summary judgment "must make clear what information is sought

1 and how it would preclude summary judgment.”). Accordingly, plaintiffs’ motion for an
2 order shortening time is DENIED without prejudice.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 Dated: April 17, 2007



5 CHARLES R. BREYER
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28